



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

**CERTIFIED MAIL**  
**RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

SEP 21 2011

Bryan Lanza, Campaign Manager  
Bill Binnie for U.S. Senate  
P.O. Box 600  
Portsmouth, N.H. 03802

RE: MUR 6346  
Cornerstone Action  
Friends of Kelly Ayotte and  
Theodore V. Koch, in his official  
capacity as treasurer

Dear Mr. Lanza:

On September 15, 2011, the Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated August 5, 2010, and found that, on the basis of the information provided in your complaint, and information provided by the respondents, there is no reason to believe Cornerstone Action violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(a) and 441b. The Commission also found that there is no reason to believe Friends of Kelly Ayotte and Theodore V. Koch, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(f) and 441b. Additionally, the Commission was equally divided on whether to find reason to believe Cornerstone Action violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(g)(2). Accordingly, on September 15, 2011, the Commission closed the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66,132 (Dec. 14, 2009). The Factual and Legal Analyses, which more fully explain the Commission's no reason to believe findings, are enclosed. A Statement of Reasons providing a basis for the Commission's decision with respect to whether to find reason to believe Cornerstone Action violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(g)(2) will follow.

11044303963

MUR 6346 (Cornerstone Action)  
Bryan Lanza, Campaign Manager  
Page 2

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Anthony Herman  
General Counsel

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mark Shonkwiler", followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

BY: Mark Shonkwiler  
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosures  
Factual and Legal Analyses

11044303964

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2  
3 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

4  
5 **RESPONDENT:**

Cornerstone Action

MUR 6346

6  
7  
8 **I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

9  
10 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by  
11 Bryan Lanza. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).

12 **II. FACTUAL SUMMARY**

13 This matter concerns allegations that Cornerstone Action, a New Hampshire-based  
14 501(c)(4) organization, made an excessive and prohibited corporate in-kind contribution to  
15 Friends of Kelly Ayotte ("Ayotte Committee" or "Committee"), Kelly Ayotte's principal  
16 campaign committee for U.S. Senate in New Hampshire in 2010. Complainant alleges that  
17 Cornerstone Action coordinated its expenditures for a television advertisement attacking Bill  
18 Binnie, one of Ms. Ayotte's Republican Senate primary opponents, with the Ayotte Committee.  
19 Complainant asserts that the Ayotte Committee was involved in the creation of Cornerstone  
20 Action's advertisement because the advertisement utilizes video footage of Binnie from a public  
21 event that was allegedly recorded by a former Ayotte campaign employee. Respondents  
22 maintain that Cornerstone did not obtain the video footage from the Ayotte Committee, and that  
23 it was publicly available material that could be downloaded from the YouTube website.

24 **A. Background**

25 Cornerstone Action incorporated as a non-profit corporation in New Hampshire in 2005  
26 and is organized under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. *See* Complaint Exhibit  
27 1. According to its website, Cornerstone Action is an issue-oriented advocacy group that  
28 promotes traditional values, limited government, and free markets through education,

11044303965

1 information, and advocacy. *See* [www.nhcornerstone.org](http://www.nhcornerstone.org). Cornerstone Action appears to  
2 conduct extensive legislative advocacy within the State of New Hampshire. *Id.* The group's  
3 website tracks state legislation on a variety of issues and provides information on Cornerstone  
4 Action-sponsored events, including pro-life and Tea Party rallies.

5 At various times, Cornerstone Action has conducted activities in connection with both  
6 federal and state elections. For example, in 2010, Cornerstone Action filed independent  
7 expenditure reports for a total of \$23,298 in expenditures for radio and newspaper  
8 advertisements opposing Senate candidate Bill Binnie. Cornerstone Action also conducted  
9 numerous activities in connection with 2010 New Hampshire state elections, including endorsing  
10 candidates for state office. *See, e.g.*, Kevin Landrigan, "Social Conservative Group Blows  
11 Jennifer's Horn," *Nashua Telegraph.com*, July 20, 2010 (available at  
12 [http://blogs.nashuatelegraph.com/nhprimecuts/2010/07/20/social-conservative-group-blows-](http://blogs.nashuatelegraph.com/nhprimecuts/2010/07/20/social-conservative-group-blows-jennifers-horn/)  
13 [jennifers-horn/](http://blogs.nashuatelegraph.com/nhprimecuts/2010/07/20/social-conservative-group-blows-jennifers-horn/)). Press accounts also reported that Cornerstone Action and the National  
14 Organization for Marriage jointly spent \$450,000 on radio and television advertisements that  
15 criticized New Hampshire Governor John Lynch in connection with the gubernatorial election  
16 for signing a same-sex marriage bill. Norma Love, "Ad Criticizes NH Gov for Signing Gay  
17 Marriage Law," *Boston Globe*, October 4, 2010 (available at  
18 [http://www.boston.com/news/local/new\\_hampshire/articles/2010/10/04/ad\\_criticizes\\_nh\\_gov\\_fa](http://www.boston.com/news/local/new_hampshire/articles/2010/10/04/ad_criticizes_nh_gov_fa)  
19 [r\\_signing\\_gay\\_marriage\\_law/](http://www.boston.com/news/local/new_hampshire/articles/2010/10/04/ad_criticizes_nh_gov_fa_r_signing_gay_marriage_law/)).

20 On August 4, 2010, Cornerstone Action began airing a television advertisement entitled  
21 "The Feeling is Mutual," which criticized Bill Binnie, a candidate in the Republican primary  
22 election for Senate in New Hampshire. *See* <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aq0tSsxtJA4>.  
23 The advertisement includes several seconds of video footage of Bill Binnie displayed on a

11044303966

1 television monitor with the on-screen caption, "BINNIE: 'I'm looking at a value-added tax.'  
2 Speaking in Windham, New Hampshire, YouTube video posted May 20, 2010." *Id.* The  
3 advertisement includes several similar video clips of Bill Binnie accompanied by on-screen  
4 captions of Binnie's statements about policy issues. The advertisement is narrated by voiceover  
5 with the following script:

6 Bill Binnie portrays himself as a conservative. Truth is he's shockingly liberal.  
7 Binnie supports abortion to avoid the expense of disabled children. He's excited  
8 about imposing gay marriage on New Hampshire. He's praised key elements of  
9 Obama's healthcare bill. He's even said that he's open to imposing a European-  
10 style value added tax on working families. With these shockingly liberal  
11 positions, it's no wonder Bill Binnie says he doesn't like the Republican Party.  
12 Now New Hampshire Republicans can tell Binnie the feeling is mutual.  
13

14 Although neither the complaint nor the response indicate the amount spent on the advertisement,  
15 there are press reports indicating that Cornerstone Action paid \$125,000 to broadcast it.<sup>1</sup> Sean  
16 Sullivan, "Binnie Under Fire from Conservative Group," *Hotline on Call*, August 5, 2010  
17 (available at [http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2010/08/binnie\\_under\\_fi.php](http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2010/08/binnie_under_fi.php)).

#### 18 B. Alleged Coordination

19 The complaint alleges that Cornerstone Action coordinated its "The Feeling is Mutual"  
20 advertisement with the Ayotte Committee, resulting in Cornerstone Action making, and the  
21 Ayotte Committee accepting, a prohibited corporate and excessive in-kind contribution. The  
22 complaint alleges that a former Ayotte Committee employee, Harold Parker, recorded the video  
23 footage included in the Cornerstone Action advertisement. Complaint at 2. An attached  
24 affidavit of Matt Mayberry, the Assistant Campaign Manager for Bill Binnie for U.S. Senate,  
25 states that he accompanied Bill Binnie to a Windham Republican Party meeting in Windham,

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the last two sentences, the "The Feeling is Mutual" television ad is similar to a radio ad critical of Mr. Binnie that Cornerstone Action ran earlier in the summer of 2010. Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k-25Z-nXoTk>.

1 New Hampshire on April 20, 2010, and that he observed Harold Parker, who he believes to have  
2 been a field director for the Ayotte campaign at the time, filming the meeting on a “flip-style”  
3 video camera; and that the video footage allegedly filmed by Parker is the same footage that  
4 appears in the Cornerstone Action advertisement. Complaint Exhibit 3, Mayberry Affidavit  
5 at ¶¶ 4-8.

6 The complaint also alleges that Kevin Smith, the Executive Director of Cornerstone  
7 Action and Cornerstone Policy Research, has long-standing personal and professional ties to  
8 Kelly Ayotte, and also asserts that Smith and Ayotte worked together in the New Hampshire  
9 Governor’s office in 2003. Complaint at 2. The complaint argues that the relationship between  
10 Smith and Ayotte makes it “reasonable to conclude” that Cornerstone Action became aware of,  
11 and was provided with, the footage by the Ayotte Committee. Complaint at 5.

12 Cornerstone Action’s response states that it did not obtain the video footage in its “The  
13 Feeling is Mutual” advertisement from the Ayotte Committee and denies that the Ayotte  
14 Committee had involvement in any of its communications. Cornerstone Action Response at 2.  
15 In the response, Kevin Smith states that he does not know whether an agent of the Ayotte  
16 campaign originally filmed the video footage included in the advertisement. *Id.* The response  
17 explains that Cornerstone Action obtained the footage from a link to a video posted on YouTube  
18 included in a news article in the *Nashua Telegraph* on May 23, 2010. *Id.* See Kevin Landrigan,  
19 “Outside Opinions Disputed,” *Nashua Telegraph*, May 23, 2010 (available at  
20 <http://www.nashuatelegraph.com/news/statenewengland/746598-227/outside-opinions->  
21 [disputed.html](http://www.nashuatelegraph.com/news/statenewengland/746598-227/outside-opinions-disputed.html)) and YouTube video “binnie-2.mov” (available at  
22 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yterozcbsyo>).

11044303968

1 Cornerstone Action contends that because the video footage was obtained from a public  
2 source, YouTube, and not the Ayotte Committee, it falls within the publicly available source  
3 exception to the “material involvement” conduct prong of the coordinated communications test.  
4 Cornerstone Action Response at 2. *See* 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(2). The response also argues that  
5 the complaint does not allege that the Ayotte Committee was materially involved in Cornerstone  
6 Action’s decision-making process regarding the advertisement and thus the allegation does not  
7 satisfy the “material involvement” conduct prong of the coordinated communications test. *Id.*  
8 at 2. *See* 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(2). Finally, Smith disputes the complaint’s assertion that  
9 he worked with Kelly Ayotte in the New Hampshire Governor’s office and that even if he  
10 had such a relationship, it would not be relevant to establishing coordination.

11 Cornerstone Action Response at 1.

12 **III. ANALYSIS**

13 The Commission finds no reason to believe that Cornerstone Action violated 2 U.S.C.  
14 §§ 441a(a) and 441b by making an excessive and prohibited in-kind contribution in the form of a  
15 coordinated communication.

16 Under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (“the Act”), a corporation  
17 is prohibited from making any contribution in connection with a Federal election, and candidates  
18 and political committees are prohibited from knowingly accepting corporate contributions.

19 2 U.S.C. § 441b. During the 2010 election cycle, individuals were prohibited from contributing  
20 over \$2,400 per election to a candidate’s authorized political committee and authorized  
21 committees were prohibited from accepting contributions from individuals in excess of \$2,400.

22 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(a) and 441a(f). An expenditure made by any person “in cooperation,  
23 consultation, or concert, with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate, his authorized

11044303969

1 political committees or their agents” constitutes an in-kind contribution. 2 U.S.C.  
2 § 441a(a)(7)(B)(i). A communication is coordinated with a candidate, a candidate’s authorized  
3 committee, or agent of the candidate or committee when the communication satisfies the three-  
4 pronged test set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a): (1) the communication is paid for by a person  
5 other than that candidate or authorized committee; (2) the communication satisfies at least one of  
6 the content standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c); and (3) the communication satisfies at  
7 least one of the content standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). The Commission’s  
8 regulations at 11 C.F.R. § 109.21 provide that coordinated communications constitute in-kind  
9 contributions from the party paying for such communications to the candidate, the candidate’s  
10 authorized committee, or the political party committee which coordinates the communication.

11 **A. Payment**

12 The payment prong of the coordination regulation, 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a)(1), is satisfied.  
13 Cornerstone Action’s response acknowledges that it was responsible for the advertisement at  
14 issue in the complaint. Cornerstone Action Response at 1. The advertisement’s disclaimer states  
15 that it was paid for by Cornerstone Action and the National Organization for Marriage.

16 **B. Content**

17 The content prong of the coordination regulation is also satisfied. The content prong is  
18 satisfied if the communication at issue meets at least one of the following content standards: (1)  
19 a communication that is an electioneering communication under 11 C.F.R. § 100.29; (2) a public  
20 communication that disseminates, distributes, or republishes, in whole or in part, campaign  
21 materials prepared by a candidate or the candidate’s authorized committee; (3) a public  
22 communication that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate  
23 for Federal office; or (4) a public communication, in relevant part, that refers to a clearly

11044303970

1 identified House or Senate candidate, and is publicly distributed or disseminated in the clearly  
2 identified candidate's jurisdiction 90 days or fewer before the candidate's primary election.<sup>2</sup> See  
3 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c).

4 Cornerstone Action's advertisement identified Senate candidate Bill Binnie and was  
5 broadcast on television on August 4, 2010, 41 days before the September 14, 2010 Republican  
6 primary election in New Hampshire. Thus, the communication at issue in the complaint satisfies  
7 the content prong by constituting a public communication referring to a clearly identified  
8 candidate distributed within 90 days of an election.

9 **C. Conduct**

10 The Commission's regulations set forth the following six types of conduct between the  
11 payor and the committee, whether or not there is agreement or formal collaboration, that satisfy  
12 the conduct prong of the coordination standard: (1) the communication "is created, produced, or  
13 distributed at the request or suggestion of a candidate or an authorized committee," or if the  
14 communication is created, produced, or distributed at the suggestion of the payor and the  
15 candidate or authorized committee assents to the suggestion; (2) the candidate, his or her  
16 committee, or their agent is materially involved in the content, intended audience, means or  
17 mode of communication, the specific media outlet used, or the timing or frequency of the  
18 communication; (3) the communication is created, produced, or distributed after at least one  
19 substantial discussion about the communication between the person paying for the  
20 communication, or that person's employees or agents, and the candidate or his or her authorized  
21 committee, his or her opponent or opponent's authorized committee, a political party committee,

---

<sup>2</sup> A "public communication" is defined as a communication by means of any broadcast, cable or satellite communication, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mass mailing or telephone bank, or any other form of general public political advertising. 11 C.F.R. § 100.26.

11044303971

1 or any of their agents;<sup>3</sup> (4) a common vendor uses or conveys information material to the  
2 creation, production, or distribution of the communication; (5) a former employee or independent  
3 contractor uses or conveys information material to the creation, production, or distribution of the  
4 communication; and (6) the dissemination, distribution, or republication of campaign materials.<sup>4</sup>  
5 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(1)-(6).

6 The material involvement and substantial discussion standards of the conduct prong are  
7 not satisfied “if the information material to the creation, production, or distribution of the  
8 communication was obtained from a publicly available source.” 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(2) and  
9 (3). *See also Explanation and Justification for the Regulations on Coordinated*  
10 *Communications*, 71 Fed. Reg. 33190, 33205 (June 8, 2006) (explaining that “[u]nder the new  
11 safe harbor, a communication created with information found . . . on a candidate’s or political  
12 party’s Web site, or learned from a public campaign speech . . . is not a coordinated  
13 communication”). However, to qualify for the safe harbor for the use of publicly available  
14 information, the person or organization paying for communication “bears the burden of showing  
15 that the information used in creating, producing or distributing the communication was obtained  
16 from a publicly available source.” *Id.* As one way of meeting this burden, the person or  
17 organization paying for the communication may demonstrate that the information used in the  
18 communication was obtained from a publicly available website. *Id.*

19 Cornerstone Action has demonstrated that the video footage of Bill Binnie used in its  
20 advertisement was obtained from a publicly available source, specifically a video on the

---

<sup>3</sup> A “substantial discussion” includes informing the payor about the campaign’s plans, projects, activities, or needs, or providing the payor with information material to the communication. *See* 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(3).

<sup>4</sup> The last standard applies only if there was a request or suggestion, material involvement, or substantial discussion that took place after the original preparation of the campaign materials that are disseminated, distributed, or republished.

11044303972

1 YouTube website that was posted on May 20, 2010, and referenced in a news article in the  
2 *Nashua Telegraph* several days later. The YouTube website indicates that the video was  
3 uploaded by a user named "nhvoter," and there is no indication on the YouTube website that this  
4 user was associated with the Ayotte campaign. See  
5 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yterozcbsyo>.

6 Cornerstone Action has specifically denied that Cornerstone Action obtained the footage  
7 from the Ayotte Committee and there is no information to suggest otherwise. Additionally, the  
8 available information does not indicate that the Ayotte Committee was materially involved in  
9 any decisions regarding Cornerstone Action's advertisement.

10 The available information also does not indicate that the various other tests for the  
11 conduct prong were satisfied. There is no available information indicating that the Cornerstone  
12 Action advertisement was created at the request or suggestion of the Ayotte Committee, that the  
13 Ayotte Committee was materially involved in the content or distribution of the advertisement,  
14 or that the advertisement was created after a substantial discussion about the communication  
15 between representatives of Cornerstone Action and the Ayotte Committee. There is nothing to  
16 suggest that Cornerstone Action and the Ayotte Committee shared a common vendor or that a  
17 former Ayotte Committee employee worked with Cornerstone Action on its advertisement.  
18 There is also no basis on which to conclude that the footage would constitute republication of  
19 campaign material, because the available information does not establish that the video footage  
20 constituted Ayotte Committee campaign materials. Accordingly, the Commission finds no  
21 reason to believe that Cornerstone Action violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(a) and 441b by making an  
22 excessive and prohibited in-kind contribution in the form of a coordinated communication.

11044303973

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2  
3 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

4  
5 **RESPONDENTS:** Friends of Kelly Ayotte and Theodore V. Koch, **MUR 6346**  
6 in his official capacity as treasurer  
7

8  
9 **I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

10 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by  
11 Bryan Lanza. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).  
12

13 **II. FACTUAL SUMMARY**

14 This matter concerns allegations that Friends of Kelly Ayotte (“Ayotte Committee” or  
15 “Committee”), Kelly Ayotte’s principal campaign committee for U.S. Senate in New Hampshire  
16 in 2010, accepted an excessive and prohibited corporate in-kind contribution from Cornerstone  
17 Action, a New Hampshire-based 501(c)(4) organization. Complainant alleges that Cornerstone  
18 Action coordinated its expenditures for a television advertisement attacking Bill Binnie, one of  
19 Ms. Ayotte’s Republican Senate primary opponents, with the Ayotte Committee. Complainant  
20 asserts that the Ayotte Committee was involved in the creation of Cornerstone Action’s  
21 advertisement because the advertisement utilizes video footage of Binnie from a public event  
22 that was allegedly recorded by a former Ayotte campaign employee. Respondents maintain that  
23 Cornerstone did not obtain the video footage from the Ayotte Committee, and that it was  
24 publicly available material that could be downloaded from the YouTube website.

25 **A. Background**

26 On August 4, 2010, Cornerstone Action began airing a television advertisement entitled  
27 “The Feeling is Mutual,” which criticized Bill Binnie, a candidate in the Republican primary  
28 election for Senate in New Hampshire. See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aq0tSsxtJA4>.

1104430397A

1 The advertisement includes several seconds of video footage of Bill Binnie displayed on a  
2 television monitor with the on-screen caption, "BINNIE: 'I'm looking at a value-added tax.'  
3 Speaking in Windham, New Hampshire, YouTube video posted May 20, 2010." *Id.* The  
4 advertisement includes several similar video clips of Bill Binnie accompanied by on-screen  
5 captions of Binnie's statements about policy issues. The advertisement is narrated by voiceover  
6 with the following script:

7 Bill Binnie portrays himself as a conservative. Truth is he's shockingly liberal.  
8 Binnie supports abortion to avoid the expense of disabled children. He's excited  
9 about imposing gay marriage on New Hampshire. He's praised key elements of  
10 Obama's healthcare bill. He's even said that he's open to imposing a European-  
11 style value added tax on working families. With these shockingly liberal  
12 positions, it's no wonder Bill Binnie says he doesn't like the Republican Party.  
13 Now New Hampshire Republicans can tell Binnie the feeling is mutual.  
14

15 Although neither the complaint nor the response indicate the amount spent on the advertisement,  
16 there are press reports indicating that Cornerstone Action paid \$125,000 to broadcast it.<sup>1</sup> Sean  
17 Sullivan, "Binnie Under Fire from Conservative Group," *Hotline on Call*, August 5, 2010  
18 (available at [http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2010/08/binnie\\_under\\_fi.php](http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2010/08/binnie_under_fi.php)).

19 **B. Alleged Coordination**

20 The complaint alleges that Cornerstone Action coordinated its "The Feeling is Mutual"  
21 advertisement with the Ayotte Committee, resulting in Cornerstone Action making, and the  
22 Ayotte Committee accepting, a prohibited corporate and excessive in-kind contribution. The  
23 complaint alleges that a former Ayotte Committee employee, Harold Parker, recorded the video  
24 footage included in the Cornerstone Action advertisement. Complaint at 2. An attached  
25 affidavit of Matt Mayberry, the Assistant Campaign Manager for Bill Binnie for U.S. Senate,

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the last two sentences, the "The Feeling is Mutual" television ad is similar to a radio ad critical of Mr. Binnie that Cornerstone Action ran earlier in the summer of 2010. Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k-25Z-mXoTk>.

1 states that he accompanied Bill Binnie to a Windham Republican Party meeting in Windham,  
2 New Hampshire on April 20, 2010, and that he observed Harold Parker, who he believes to have  
3 been a field director for the Ayotte campaign at the time, filming the meeting on a “flip-style”  
4 video camera; and that the video footage allegedly filmed by Parker is the same footage that  
5 appears in the Cornerstone Action advertisement. Complaint Exhibit 3, Mayberry Affidavit  
6 at ¶¶ 4-8.

7 The complaint also alleges that Kevin Smith, the Executive Director of Cornerstone  
8 Action and Cornerstone Policy Research, has long-standing personal and professional ties to  
9 Kelly Ayotte, and also asserts that Smith and Ayotte worked together in the New Hampshire  
10 Governor’s office in 2003. Complaint at 2. The complaint argues that the relationship between  
11 Smith and Ayotte makes it “reasonable to conclude” that Cornerstone Action became aware of,  
12 and was provided with, the footage by the Ayotte Committee. Complaint at 5.

13 The Ayotte Committee contends that there was no coordination between the Committee  
14 and Cornerstone Action. Ayotte Committee Response at 1. The Committee’s response includes  
15 a letter from Brooks Kochvar, a representative of the Ayotte Committee, to Bill Binnie, dated  
16 August 4, 2010. See Ayotte Committee Response Exhibit A. The letter states that the accusation  
17 of coordination between the Committee and Cornerstone Action is false and that the Committee  
18 first learned of the Cornerstone Action advertisement in the press on August 4, 2010. *Id.* at 1.  
19 The letter disputes the allegation that Cornerstone Action supported Kelly Ayotte, as  
20 Cornerstone’s Chairman endorsed another candidate in the Republican primary election. *Id.*  
21 The letter further states that the Ayotte Committee did not provide the video footage in the  
22 advertisement, and notes that a link to the video was included in a *Nashua Telegraph* article over

11044303976

1 two months prior to the dissemination of the Cornerstone Action advertisement and was  
2 available for any member of the public to download. *Id.*

3 **III. ANALYSIS**

4 The Commission finds no reason to believe that Friends of Kelly Ayotte and Theodore V.  
5 Koch, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(f) and 441b by receiving an  
6 excessive and prohibited in-kind contribution in the form of a coordinated communication.

7 Under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"), a corporation  
8 is prohibited from making any contribution in connection with a Federal election, and candidates  
9 and political committees are prohibited from knowingly accepting corporate contributions.

10 2 U.S.C. § 441b. During the 2010 election cycle, individuals were prohibited from contributing  
11 over \$2,400 per election to a candidate's authorized political committee and authorized  
12 committees were prohibited from accepting contributions from individuals in excess of \$2,400.

13 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(a) and 441a(f). An expenditure made by any person "in cooperation,  
14 consultation, or concert, with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate, his authorized  
15 political committees or their agents" constitutes an in-kind contribution. 2 U.S.C.

16 § 441a(a)(7)(B)(i). A communication is coordinated with a candidate, a candidate's authorized  
17 committee, or agent of the candidate or committee when the communication satisfies the three-  
18 pronged test set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a): (1) the communication is paid for by a person  
19 other than that candidate or authorized committee; (2) the communication satisfies at least one of  
20 the content standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c); and (3) the communication satisfies at  
21 least one of the conduct standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). The Commission's  
22 regulations at 11 C.F.R. § 109.21 provide that coordinated communications constitute in-kind

11044303977

1 contributions from the party paying for such communications to the candidate, the candidate's  
2 authorized committee, or the political party committee which coordinates the communication.

3 **A. Payment**

4 The payment prong of the coordination regulation, 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a)(1), is satisfied.  
5 The advertisement's disclaimer states that it was paid for by Cornerstone Action and the National  
6 Organization for Marriage.

7 **B. Content**

8 The content prong of the coordination regulation is also satisfied. The content prong is  
9 satisfied if the communication at issue meets at least one of the following content standards: (1)  
10 a communication that is an electioneering communication under 11 C.F.R. § 100.29; (2) a public  
11 communication that disseminates, distributes, or republishes, in whole or in part, campaign  
12 materials prepared by a candidate or the candidate's authorized committee; (3) a public  
13 communication that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate  
14 for Federal office; or (4) a public communication, in relevant part, that refers to a clearly  
15 identified House or Senate candidate, and is publicly distributed or disseminated in the clearly  
16 identified candidate's jurisdiction 90 days or fewer before the candidate's primary election.<sup>2</sup> See  
17 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c).

18 Cornerstone Action's advertisement identified Senate candidate Bill Binnie and was  
19 broadcast on television on August 4, 2010, 41 days before the September 14, 2010 Republican  
20 primary election in New Hampshire. Thus, the communication at issue in the complaint satisfies

---

<sup>2</sup> A "public communication" is defined as a communication by means of any broadcast, cable or satellite communication, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mass mailing or telephone bank, or any other form of general public political advertising. 11 C.F.R. § 100.26.

11044303978

1 the content prong by constituting a public communication referring to a clearly identified  
2 candidate distributed within 90 days of an election.

3 **C. Conduct**

4 The Commission's regulations set forth the following six types of conduct between the  
5 payor and the committee, whether or not there is agreement or formal collaboration, that satisfy  
6 the conduct prong of the coordination standard: (1) the communication "is created, produced, or  
7 distributed at the request or suggestion of a candidate or an authorized committee," or if the  
8 communication is created, produced, or distributed at the suggestion of the payor and the  
9 candidate or authorized committee assents to the suggestion; (2) the candidate, his or her  
10 committee, or their agent is materially involved in the content, intended audience, means or  
11 mode of communication, the specific media outlet used, or the timing or frequency of the  
12 communication; (3) the communication is created, produced, or distributed after at least one  
13 substantial discussion about the communication between the person paying for the  
14 communication, or that person's employees or agents, and the candidate or his or her authorized  
15 committee, his or her opponent or opponent's authorized committee, a political party committee,  
16 or any of their agents;<sup>3</sup> (4) a common vendor uses or conveys information material to the  
17 creation, production, or distribution of the communication; (5) a former employee or independent  
18 contractor uses or conveys information material to the creation, production, or distribution of the  
19 communication; and (6) the dissemination, distribution, or republication of campaign materials.<sup>4</sup>  
20 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(1)-(6).

---

<sup>3</sup> A "substantial discussion" includes informing the payor about the campaign's plans, projects, activities, or needs, or providing the payor with information material to the communication. See 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(3).

<sup>4</sup> The last standard applies only if there was a request or suggestion, material involvement, or substantial discussion that took place after the original preparation of the campaign materials that are disseminated, distributed, or republished.

11044303979

1           The material involvement and substantial discussion standards of the conduct prong are  
2 not satisfied “if the information material to the creation, production, or distribution of the  
3 communication was obtained from a publicly available source.” 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(2) and  
4 (3). *See also Explanation and Justification for the Regulations on Coordinated*  
5 *Communications*, 71 Fed. Reg. 33190, 33205 (June 8, 2006) (explaining that “[u]nder the new  
6 safe harbor, a communication created with information found . . . on a candidate’s or political  
7 party’s Web site, or learned from a public campaign speech . . . is not a coordinated  
8 communication”). However, to qualify for the safe harbor for the use of publicly available  
9 information, the person or organization paying for communication “bears the burden of showing  
10 that the information used in creating, producing or distributing the communication was obtained  
11 from a publicly available source.” *Id.* As one way of meeting this burden, the person or  
12 organization paying for the communication may demonstrate that the information used in the  
13 communication was obtained from a publicly available website. *Id.*

14           The available information indicates that the video footage of Bill Binnie used in  
15 Cornerstone Action’s advertisement was obtained from a publicly available source, specifically a  
16 video on the YouTube website that was posted on May 20, 2010, and referenced in a news article  
17 in the *Nashua Telegraph* several days later. The YouTube website indicates that the video was  
18 uploaded by a user named “nhvotr,” and there is no indication on the YouTube website that this  
19 user was associated with the Ayotte campaign. *See*  
20 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yterozcbsyo>.

21           The Ayotte Committee has specifically denied that Cornerstone Action obtained the  
22 footage from the Committee and there is no information to suggest otherwise. Additionally, the

11044303980

1 available information does not indicate that the Ayotte Committee was materially involved in  
2 any decisions regarding Cornerstone Action's advertisement.

3       The available information also does not indicate that the various other tests for the  
4 conduct prong were satisfied. There is no available information indicating that the Cornerstone  
5 Action advertisement was created at the request or suggestion of the Ayotte Committee, that the  
6 Ayotte Committee was materially involved in the content or distribution of the advertisement,  
7 or that the advertisement was created after a substantial discussion about the communication  
8 between representatives of Cornerstone Action and the Ayotte Committee. There is nothing to  
9 suggest that Cornerstone Action and the Ayotte Committee shared a common vendor or that a  
10 former Ayotte Committee employee worked with Cornerstone Action on its advertisement.  
11 There is also no basis on which to conclude that the footage would constitute republication of  
12 campaign material, because the available information does not establish that the video footage  
13 constituted Ayotte Committee campaign materials. Accordingly, the Commission finds no  
14 reason to believe that Friends of Kelly Ayotte and Theodore V. Koch, in his official capacity as  
15 treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(f) and 441b by receiving an excessive and prohibited in-kind  
16 contribution in the form of a coordinated communication.

11044303981